



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/608,467

06/25/2003

Gary K. Burma

H0003936 US

9362

128 7590 08/10/2007  
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.  
101 COLUMBIA ROAD  
P O BOX 2245  
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245

EXAMINER

FORTUNA, JOSE A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1731

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/10/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/608,467	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BURMA, GARY K.	
	<b>Examiner</b> José A. Fortuna	<b>Art Unit</b> 1731	

**All Participants:**

 (1) José A. Fortuna.

 (2) Naren Thappeta.
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

 (3) Gary Burma.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 2 August 2007
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:


**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The cited references were discussed as to why such references would not have all the limitations of the claimed system. The examiner indicated that it is the examiner contention that in view of advances in the technology, computer control and in view of the cited references, the controlling of the individual nozzles would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Mr. Burma replied that while controlling the individual nozzles would have been obvious, the controlling of shape of the actuators individually would not be. The reasons would be detailed explained in the next response.